

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the January 3, 2007 Office Action. Applicants respectfully request entry of the requested amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Response to Claim Objections

Claims 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 20, 42 and 43 stand rejected based on several informalities. Applicants amend the claims herein to correct any informalities and Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now comply with all requirements of 35 U.S.C.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,477,645 issued to Drews in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0023059 to Bari, et al. . The rejection asserts that Drews allegedly teaches each element of the claims except for a master credential, which is allegedly taught by Bari.

The claims as amended are directed toward receiving a request to generate the application credential, wherein the request includes a non-arbitrary application identifier; and generating the application credential using the non-arbitrary application identifier and a master credential associated with the device.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests the use of a non-arbitrary application identifier and a master credential to generate the application credential. Paragraph [0048] of the present application (as published) teaches the concept of not having an arbitrary application ID. The paragraph reads as follows:

At block 304, the application requests an application credential from the credential system so that the application can authenticate to a data server to retrieve data. In one embodiment, the application's ID 212 is provided to the credential generation logic 206, as shown by path 216 in a request for an application credential. *Note that the application's ID 212 is provided after being checked so that an application can not provide an arbitrary ID in order to get credentials for other applications.*

By requiring a non-arbitrary application ID, the present claims increase the security as described above by not allowing an application to get a credential for other applications. Hash functions, by their operation, produce arbitrary results. Thus, by using a hash function, Drews specifically teaches the use of an arbitrary ID. Bari is silent on the use of an application ID. Thus, none of the cited art teaches the current claims of having a non-arbitrary application ID.

Further, the cited art also does not suggest the combination of any application ID and the master credential. The rejection states it would be obvious to one of skill in the art to modify Drews by the master credential in Bari to teach the present claims. However, Drews discloses the concept of a public key (master credential) in the background, thus the master credential was known to Drews at the time. Even though Drews discloses both the application ID and the public key (master credential), Drews never suggests combining the two to create an application credential. If this was obvious to one of skill in the art, it should be disclosed in Drews. Nothing else in the art even suggests at creating an application credential using both an application ID and a master credential.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 24, 28, 32, 36 and 40 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 24, 28, 32, 36 and 40 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 24, 28, 32, 36 and 40.

Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-17, 19-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-35, 37-39 and 41-45 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 24, 28, 32, 36 and 40, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-17, 19-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-35, 37-39 and 41-45 are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-17, 19-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-35, 37-39 and 41-45.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated July 3, 2007

:

By: /James T. Hagler/

James T. Hagler

Reg. No. 40,631

(858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502